

The Carroll Free Press.

"THE UNION OF THE STATES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNION."

VOLUME 24,---NUMBER 42.

CARROLLTON, CARROLL COUNTY, OHIO, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1856.

WHOLE NUMBER, 1,293.



Written for the Free Press.
The Call.

Ats "Nelly Bly."

Brothers we rally home
To the platform of the free
Comet 'tis liberty and right
Against wrong and slavery,
All the world is gazing now
On our threatened land
Haste to rescue o're we are
Marked with slavery's brand.

CHORUS

No brothers no sisters
Listen to the call
Wrong and right, on the battle field
One of these must fall.

Listen brothers to the shriek
Of Kansas' smitten land
Pluck her from her living death
With a strong right hand,
Save her from her fearful doom
Give her freedom's roar
And ages yet unborn, shall rise—
Up and call you blest.

CHORUS

Brothers sisters, each and all
List, we call to you
Stand like rocks in a van midst
Firm and strong and true.

Come along, hold and strong
In this glorious cause
To save the dove of liberty
From slavery's greedy jaws.
Now's the time, the crisis hour
Present surely on
Now's the time a sacred power
Is to be lost or won.

CHORUS

No sisters, no brothers
Shall we call in vain,
Shall tyrants foot fore ever
Scorch Kansas' fertile plain?

Rise in power, claim your meed
Wake up and shout the cry,
Arm, for the battle is at hand
The crisis hour is nigh,
Rise and hurl the tyrants back
Ere they wield the band
Ere slavery's blighting leprosy track
Has branded all our land.

CHORUS

No brothers! rise brothers
Break the tyrants power,
Glad win for ages yet to come
Freedom's glorious dower.

FLORANCE.

Miscellaneous Reading.

Hon. Ephraim Marsh for Fremont.

Hon. Ephraim Marsh, of New Jersey, was President of the National American Convention, held at Philadelphia, at which Fillmore and Donelson were nominated and the American Platform adopted. He is a candid man, and a sincere and very distinguished member of the American party. There is no man, North or South, whose opinion is entitled to greater weight than his, on the subject of the following admirable letter.

SCHOOL MOUNTAIN, N. J.
Sept. 10, 1856.

Messrs. John H. Lyon, Joseph W. Allen, L. O. E. H. Grandin, J. B. Cornell, John R. Weeks:

GENTLEMEN.—Having been constrained by the course of public events, occurring since the meeting of the National American Convention by which the Hon. Millard Fillmore was nominated for President of the United States, over which Convention I had the honor to preside, to renounce that nomination, you, as my colleagues in that Convention, are entitled to my reasons for so doing and I will proceed briefly but frankly to state them.

It was known to my friends at Philadelphia that the pro-slavery platform there adopted, and which drove so many Northern delegates from the Convention, was repugnant to my sentiments and sympathies. But confiding in the principles of Mr. Fillmore who, in the Legislature of New York, and in Congress, had ever acted with the friends of freedom, I acquiesced in an exceptional platform. In view of the perfidious repeal of the Missouri compromise, and the aggressions and outrages perpetrated by Missourians upon Kansas, with more than the approval of the general government, looked for some expression of the sentiments which pervaded the whole North—sentiments that Mr. Fillmore had ever professed, in his letter of acceptance. But in this expectation I was disappointed. There was a studied and significant avoidance, in that letter, of the question upon which he knew, as we all know, the Presidential election is to be decided either in favor of, or against slavery extension. Nor was I less disappointed in finding the friends of Mr. Fillmore in Congress, voting steadily, throughout a protracted session, with the supporters of aggression and outrage in Kansas, and persisting in such votes, after the report

of the Kansas Congressional Committee, it had been irrefragably proven that the election in Kansas had been carried by armed bodies of men from Missouri; that an infamous code of Territorial laws had been enacted in Kansas by Missourians; that settlers in Kansas had been robbed and murdered by Missourians; that organized and armed bodies of men from Missouri and other slave states had sworn, in secret societies, that Kansas shall become a slave State; and finally, that all these outrages were perpetrated with the aid and approbation of a United States Judge and Marshal, and in the presence of United States troops. But these great wrongs, though arousing the just indignation of freemen, have elicited no word of reproof from Mr. Fillmore. On the contrary, in his speech at Albany, he astounded the country in declaring that the election of Col. Fremont, by the spontaneous suffrages of a majority of the citizens of the republic, would occasion a dissolution of the Union. And up to the last vote in the called session of Congress, when the friends of freedom endeavored, in the Army Appropriation bill, to protect the citizens of Kansas by the adoption of a conservative proviso, Mr. Haven, the confidential partner and partisan of Mr. Fillmore, voted with the pro-slavery majority. Indeed, since the commencement of the just closed session of Congress, slavery has not obtained an advantage that it did not owe to the vote of Mr. Fillmore's friends nor has freedom encountered a defeat that did not come from the same quarter of the House of Representatives. His friends, holding the balance of power, turned the scale when it would turn in favor of slavery.

And where, or in what respect is Mr. Fillmore profited, politically, by all these sacrifices of principle?—all these violations of duty—all these surrenders of independence—all this self-abasement? What has been gained by bartering freedom for slavery? His nomination, as you know, was demanded by our Southern brethren, who would only consent, even to his nomination, upon terms that drove most of the Northern delegates out of the Convention. It was painfully apparent in the deliberations of our Convention that Americanism was but a secondary object. Slavery was with them the paramount consideration. While for the sake of the broad American principles that had taken deep hold of the public mind, we were prepared to ignore the slavery question, they insisted upon making it, and did make it, the primary article of faith in our platform.

And how, after imposing terms which have shorn the American party of its Northern strength, do the South Americans act? Have they kept or broken faith with us? In North Carolina, whose election is just over, the American party is virtually disbanded. The Hon. Mr. Puryear, an American member of Congress from that State concedes the State to Mr. Buchanan, though, aside from slavery, there is an acknowledged political majority against him.

In Kentucky, where was one year ago a triumphant American majority, our party is beaten if not annihilated. Col. Humphrey Marshall, a gallant leader, seems to have nailed his colors to the mast; but that only proves that he "is faithful among the faithless."

The Hon. Mr. Walker, of Alabama, a member of our Convention, who was among the most zealous advocates of Mr. Fillmore's nomination, has, from his seat in Congress, proclaimed his abandonment of Mr. Fillmore and his adherence to Mr. Buchanan. Senator Jones, of Tennessee, with Senators Pratt and Pearce of Maryland, life-long opponents of the democratic party, have proclaimed themselves in favor of Mr. Buchanan, and now stand along with Senators Cass, Douglass, Atchison, &c., upon the Cincinnati platform. There has been within the last three months, and since the issue which is to give freedom to, or force slavery into Kansas was made up, a regularly political stampede from the Southern whig and American parties over to the support of Mr. Buchanan.

Now, what, let me inquire, does all this mean? Mr. Fillmore, as you well know, was the nominee of the Southern States. Those delegates were not only for him, but would take none else. Why then do they abandon him? Simply because they, having but one interest in politics and watchfully consulting the political barometer, are guided by its suggestions. They calculate the chances and the cost of a Presidential election. The platform upon which they placed Mr. Fillmore offended Northern sentiments. The action in Congress, and the events in Kansas have awakened throughout the North and West an indignation so deep and pervading as to deprive Mr. Fillmore of the votes of every free State. To qualify himself for acceptance in slave States, Mr. Fillmore had to take grounds which necessarily repelled the free States; and having thus lost the North, the South, for that reason, abandons him. In this the South acts understandingly, and is true to herself. Mr. Fillmore became valueless to slavery the moment it was certain that he could not subsidize the North. And although abandoned by those who nominated him, neither Mr. Fillmore nor his friends can justly charge the South with bad faith, for the terms of the compact were distinctly understood. They aimed, with Ameri-

cianism as a cover, to extend slavery. He was to bring Northern strength. Unable from the stringency of the terms imposed, and the enormity of the outrages perpetrated in Kansas to do that, the consideration failed, and the South declares for Buchanan instead of Fillmore, as the most available candidate. If therefore, the South, as it has done whenever a "Northern man with Southern principles" ceases to be useful, lets Mr. Fillmore "slide," "he must console himself, as did Cardinal Wolsey, with the reflection that, if he had served freedom with half the zeal he has given to slavery, he would not now be left naked to his enemies." Nor is this poetic truth only, for while serving freedom, no man was more honored and respected than Millard Fillmore; rising as he did, from station to station, higher and higher, in the State and National governments, and enjoying until tempted by ambition to abandon his principles and party, universal regard and confidence.

Shall we of the North, then be required to adhere to a nomination, which has been deliberately abandoned by the South? Shall we cling to Mr. Fillmore after those most earnest for his nomination are supporting Mr. Buchanan?

This is the practical question. Let us therefore, look it practically in the face: Even in the present state of the canvass, all but one or two of the Southern States are not only sure to vote for Mr. Buchanan, but are made sure by the votes of Southern Americans who were pledged to Mr. Fillmore. As the canvass progresses, and Northern sentiment develops and concentrates in favor of Col. Fremont, the remaining one or two Southern States will declare unmistakably for Mr. Buchanan, on whom the whole South will be united.

On the other hand, the free States, with the exception of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, have or in the progress of the canvass will, declare for Fremont. The nominee of the American party, abandoned by the South, though espousing its principles, and repudiated by the North because of his subservience to the South is driven into New Jersey and Pennsylvania, two States upon which his friends hang a "forlorn hope." But does Mr. Fillmore, or any sane man, suppose or pretend that he can carry either of these States? Assuredly not.

It is certain however, and it is conceded that a union of the Americans and Republicans in both States, would take them from Buchanan and carry them where they belong, into brotherhood and fraternity with freedom.

May I not then, rely upon the patriotism of American friends, and appeal to them with confidence in favor of union here in my own State and in our sister State of Pennsylvania, for the sake of that glorious Union which we all love and cherish as an inheritance more precious than any other gift, though encumbered as portions of it necessarily was, with slavery?

Will any one tell me in reply, that our American principles forbid this union? Of such let me inquire what has been done, or sought to be done, by Southern Americans in Congress, to carry out our principles? Have they passed or attempted to pass any law upon the American question? Or have their voice and their votes been given constantly in favor of slavery extension? In refusing to unite with other friends of free Kansas (the only issue involved in the contest). Americans in New Jersey and Pennsylvania are with their eyes open to the inevitable result, aiding Mr. Buchanan, whose national and State platforms contain open denunciation of the American party, to carry the States. Yes, nothing is more certain than that New Jersey and Pennsylvania can elect or defeat Mr. Buchanan. The responsibility either way rests with the Americans. We can beat or be beaten by the party that is avowedly hostile to freedom and to Americanism. We cannot elect Mr. Fillmore, and for one, after the course pursued in Congress by his immediate representatives, after his own disloyal declarations in favor of a dissolution of the Union in the event of Col. Fremont's election, I am free to say I do not desire his success.

I have heard but two tangible reasons urged against Colonel Fremont. The first is that he is a sectional candidate. This is neither his fault nor the fault of those who support him. The repeal of the Missouri compromise was a national question and a national wrong.

If, as the repeal of that compromise, national compacts were violated, may not the people seek national redress? In what way, or by what means, can that wrong be righted but in a constitutional manner, through the ballot boxes? The freedom of Kansas and Nebraska was violated by the action of the Executive and Legislative departments of the government. May we not, without incurring the reproach of sectionalism, endeavor to re-establish freedom in those Territories by reforming the Executive and Legislative departments?

Who set up the cry of sectionalism when General Jackson, from Tennessee, and Mr. Calhoun, from South Carolina, were President and Vice President? Why, Mr. Fillmore himself, who now counsels a dissolution of the Union if Fremont and Dayton should be elected, supported sectional candidates for President and Vice President in 1832 and 1836. The idea of dissolving the Union for such a cause

is, I am happy to see, denounced by enlightened and patriotic Southern men.

General Houston, the distinguished Senator from Texas, in his closing speech in the Senate, said:

"They tell me if Fremont is elected forty thousand bayonets will be sent to the Capitol—that the South, in fact will secede. Mr. President, I scorn the suggestion. There will be neither bayonets nor secession, if Col. Fremont shall be elected by the majority of the people. Though I am not his supporter, I shall respect the majority of the people; and to Col. Fremont, as the chief magistrate of their choice, I shall pay my respectful homage." The Hon. Henry Winter Davis, a talented and eloquent American member of Congress from Maryland, holds the following sentiments, which are much more becoming an American than those uttered by Mr. Fillmore at Albany:—

"There are men who go about the country declaiming about the inevitable consequences of the election of Fremont; and the question is asked whether that simple fact is not sufficient, not merely to justify, but to require a dissolution of the Union? The question has been asked me to-day. That is a question which I do not regard as even a subject of discussion. It never will be done while men have their reason. It never will be done until some party, bent upon acquiring party power, shall again, and again, and again exasperate beyond the reach of reason the Northern, and Southern minds, as my Southern friends have now exasperated the Northern mind. It would be an act of suicide, and sane men do not commit suicide. The act itself is insanity. It will be done, if ever, in a tempest of fury and madness which cannot stop to reason. Dissolution means death, the suicide of Liberty, without a hope of resurrection—death without the glories of immortality; with no sister to mourn her fall, none to wrap her tenderly in her winding sheet and bear her tenderly to a sepulchre—dead Liberty, left to all the horrors of corruption, a loathsome thing, with a stake through the body, which men shun, cast out naked on the highway of nations, where the tyrants of the earth who feared her living, will mock her dead, passing by on the other side, wagging their heads and thrusting their tongues in their cheeks at her, saying, 'Behold her, how she that was fair among the nations, is fallen! is fallen!'—and only the few wise men who loved her out of every nation will shed tears over her dissolution as they pass, and cast handfuls of earth on her body to quiet her manes, while we, her children, stumble about her ruined habitations, to find dishonorable graves wherein to bide our shame. Dissolution? How shall it be made? Who shall make it? Do men dream of Lot and Abraham parting, one east and the other to the west, peacefully, because their servants strive? That States will divide from States, and boundary lines will be marked by compass and chain?—Sir, that will be a portentous commission that shall settle partition, for cannon will be planted at the corners and grinning skeletons be finger posts to point the way. It will be no line gently marked on the bosom of the Republic—some meandering vein whence generations of her children have drawn their nourishment—but a sharp and jagged chasm, rending the hearts of great Commonwealths, lacerated and smeared with fraternal blood. On the night when the stars of the constellation shall fall from heaven the blackness of darkness forever will settle on the liberties of mankind in this Western world."

The other objection to Mr. Fremont addresses itself particularly to Americans: It is alleged that he is a Roman Catholic. The force of this objection depends upon its truth or falsity. It is a simple question of fact. The charge originated in the New York Express, and rested upon the declaration of Alderman Fulmer, who says that when at Brown's Hotel, in Washington, in the winter of 1853, he saw Col. Fremont worshipping in a Catholic Church; that he conversed with the Colonel on the subject of religion, and that he defended the extreme doctrines of the Romish Church. By reference to the columns of the same Express, it is shown that Col. Fremont was, during the whole of the time Alderman Fulmer locates him at Washington, on board of ocean steamers. An examination of the register and cash books of Brown's Hotel show that Col. Fremont was not during the years of 1852 and '53, at the Hotel. Here is conclusive, independent evidence that Alderman Fulmer is mistaken. This testimony is confirmed by Col. Fremont's denial of the whole story. The archives of the Episcopal Church, at Washington, show that Col. Fremont's children had Protestant baptism. Mr. Livingston, who was Col. Fremont's companion across the Rocky Mountains, says that he carried with him a pocket Protestant Bible. He presented his wife with a Protestant prayerbook before their marriage.

His preceptor says that he received a Protestant education. Col. Fremont says to every body that inquires of him, that he is and ever has been a Protestant. And yet, not only in the absence of all testimony, but after every allegation has been disproved, those who fabricate continue to reiterate the falsehood, and I am sorry to add, that too many intelligent, honest electors, who would require better evidence to convict a dog caught with the wool in his mouth, of killing sheep, believe that Col. Fremont is a Papist.

It is said you will remember, by many of our friends at Philadelphia, that Mr. Fillmore's name would be used at the South merely to divide the friends of freedom at the North. I did not believe it then, nor do I know that such was their design but that Mr. Fillmore's name is now only used for that purpose is transparently certain. Nor should this surprise us, for it is just what the past has often revealed.

Mr. Van Buren, who for thirty years was devoted to the South, hesitated about the admission of Texas, and was thrown overboard.

General Pierce, literally used up in promoting the repeal of the Missouri compromise and in sustaining border ruffianism, was remorselessly sacrificed at Cincinnati by the South for an "older, if not a better" doughface, whom they hope to elect. Differ as they may and do in relation to all other questions, on this very extreme of shade and sentiment and opinion unite. They regard the bank—the tariff—the public domain, &c., &c., subordinate questions, and differ upon them; but in voting upon the annexation of Texas—the admission of California—the Fugitive Slave law—the repeal of the Missouri compromise, &c., &c., they always unite; or if a Southern member gives a wrong vote, like Callum of Tennessee, and Hunt of Louisiana, they are shot down.

Why, then, should they not, as they have, make their Americanism subservient to their slavery? If, therefore, Mr. Buchanan should be elected, I see no end to the encroachments and usurpations of the slave power—and hence, I shall neither vote for nor throw my vote away. In a contest which is to determine whether slavery or freedom is to be the governing principle of this republic, I choose to cast my vote where it will tell for freedom. These considerations lead me to the support of the Republican nominees for President and Vice President, not because I am less an American than when our National Convention assembled, but because those by whom Mr. Fillmore was nominated, from Southern States, have abandoned him for a candidate openly and avowedly arrayed against both their candidate and their Americanism; and because, furthermore, by voting for Mr. Fillmore, while the contest is between Buchanan and Fremont, I should indirectly aid the former, whose principles as an anti-American and slavery extensionist, are obnoxious to all my convictions of duty.

Respectfully yours,
EPHRAIM MARSH.

Colonel Fremont's Position.

The man must be a progeny who can retain his manners and morals unimpaired by such circumstances, (the commerce between master and slave), and with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one-half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of one part and the amor patriæ of the other.—Thos. Jefferson.

It is among my first wishes to see some plan adopted, by which Slavery in this country may be abolished by law.—George Washington.

Slavery is contrary to the law of nations.—William Wirt.

We should admit to posterity our abhorrence of Slavery.—Patrick Henry.

Slavery is a dark spot on the face of the nation.—Lafayette.

We should march up to the very verge of the constitution to destroy the traffic in human flesh.—Franklin.

Slavery is the most blighting curse upon the Old Dominion; and I know of but one way of getting rid of it—by legislative authority—and so far as my vote shall go for that purpose, it shall never be wanting.—George Washington.

"The freemen of the North have a deep interest in keeping labor free, exclusively free in the new territories. * * * I have made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances will I consent to the further extension of the area of Slavery, in the United States, or to the further increase of slave representation in the House of Representatives."—Daniel Webster.

"I repeat that I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote to spread Slavery over territory where it does not exist."—Henry Clay.

"Now is the time for the North to plant itself on immovable Liberty ground. Now is the time to fix permanently the boundaries of slavery. The South would have yielded to the just claims of the North long ago if they had been pressed with a tenth part the tenacity of Southern claims."

"Their claims to extend Slavery over territory now free, is too preposterous to be entertained for a moment by any government now existing on earth, and the miserable dough-faces North who will parley with the South on this subject ought to be held up to the public scorn and contempt by every newspaper in the land."—J. W. Gray, in Cleveland Plain Dealer. Resolved, That the maintenance of the

principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States shall be preserved.—Republican Platform.

"I heartily concur in all movements which have for their object to repair the mischief arising from the violation of good faith in the repeal of the Missouri compromise. I am opposed to slavery in the abstract; and, upon principles sustained and made habitual by settled conviction. While I feel inflexible in the belief that it ought not to be interfered with where it exists, under the shield of State Sovereignty, I am inflexibly opposed to its extension on this continent beyond its present limits."—John C. Fremont.

I never owned one dollar in human flesh, and while reason holds its sway in my brain, I never will.

I love my wife with the most ardent affection, but that wife must toil with her own hands rather than own the first dollar in human flesh.—John C. Fremont.

I recognize neither American nor anti-American, Whig, Democrat, or Abolition parties, in the approaching contest; but simply a union of the people for Freedom and Kansas, and the arrest of slavery extension.—John C. Fremont.

"Free labor, the natural capital which constitutes the real wealth of this great country, and creates that intelligent power in the masses, is alone to be relied on as the bulwark of our Free Institutions."—Fremont's letter of acceptance.

If I am elected to the high office for which your partiality has nominated me, I will endeavor to administer the Government according to the true spirit of the Constitution as it was understood by the great men who framed and adopted it; and in such a way as to preserve both Liberty and the Union.—Fremont.

What Webster, Calhoun and others thought of Fremont.

"I have acquaintance with the Colonel, and am so favorably impressed as to him, that I would as readily trust him as any other individual. His integrity is beyond suspicion."—Calhoun.

"Colonel Fremont is a young officer of great merit—one who deserves well of his country for the bravery and ability with which he discharged his important and delicate duties in California."—Daniel Webster.

"Col. Fremont exhibited a combination of energy, promptitude, sagacity and prudence, which indicates the highest capacity for civil and military command. That the country will do justice to his valuable and distinguished services, I entertain not the slightest doubt."—Sen. W. D. Dix.

"Col. Fremont, in my opinion, is the most meritorious American of his age now in existence."—Senator Allen, of Ohio.

"I regard Col. Fremont as one of the most heroic and successful officers in our army—an army of which any nation might be proud."—Senator Rusk, of Texas.

Hon. J. C. Fessenden.—The history of this young man is highly interesting.

His travels, researches, scientific explorations and feats of valor, and suffering in the far west, are events known to the world, and we can say without a parallel.

His collision with Kearney in California brought him before the country in a new light. He was accused of disobeying the command of his superior and technically was so convicted on trial by the Court Martial demanded by himself. But the country acquitted him, and although reprimanded by the President, was applauded by the people. We were at his trial in Washington, and saw him confront the witnesses of the government in the most frank and gallant style.—J. W. Gray, in Plain Dealer.

I have read the history of his (Fremont's) life, and I believe him to be a man as much marked out by Providence for the present exigency of our nation as Washington was for that of the American Revolution. He comes from whence great men usually come from,—the mass of the people. Nured in difficulties, practiced in surmounting them, wise in council, full of resource; self-possessed in danger; fearless and foremost in every useful enterprise; unexceptionable in morals; with all intellect cultivated by nature, and cultivated in laborious fields of duty—I trust he is destined to save this Union from dissolution; to restore the constitution to its original purity; and to relieve that instrument which Washington designed for the preservation and enlargement of Freedom, from being any longer perverted to the multiplication of Slave States, and the extension of Slavery."—Josiah Quincy Sen.

True.—The Hon. Jesse D. Bright, one of the leading men of the Buchanan party, says:

"There is no danger of a dissolution of the Union. Neither Congress nor all the politicians in the country can dissolve the confederacy our fathers made and handed down to us."

This is of course correct; but what must be thought of the whole of the newspaper organs of Mr. Bright's party, north and south, holding up before the country constantly the bugbear of disunion? The Washington Union leads off in the movement. Of course it is a mere device to frighten timid people from the support of the Republican candidates.